# For the Northern District of California

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
8		
9		
10	SANTIAGO MONTENEGRO,	No. C 07-3906 WHA (PR)
11	Petitioner,	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
12	v.	
13	BEN CURRY, Warden,	
14	Respondent.	
15		
16	Petitioner, a California prisoner currently incarcerated at the Correctional Trai	

Petitioner, a California prisoner currently incarcerated at the Correctional Training Facility in Soledad, has filed a pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. He has paid the filing fee.

The petition attacks denial of parole, so venue is proper in this district, which is where petitioner is confined. See 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d) (venue proper in both district of conviction and district of confinement).

## **DISCUSSION**

# A. Standard of Review

This court may entertain a petition for writ of habeas corpus "in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court only on the ground that he is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a); Rose v. Hodges, 423 U.S. 19, 21 (1975).

A district court shall "award the writ or issue an order directing the respondent to show cause why the writ should not be granted, unless it appears from the application that the applicant or person detained is not entitled thereto." 28 U.S.C. § 2243. Summary dismissal is appropriate only where the allegations in the petition are vague or conclusory, palpably incredible, or patently frivolous or false. *Hendricks v. Vasquez*, 908 F.2d 490, 491 (9th Cir. 1990) (quoting *Blackledge v. Allison*, 431 U.S. 63, 75-76 (1977)).

# B. Legal Claims

Petitioner was convicted of second degree murder in 1992. He received a sentence of seventeen years to life in prison. He alleges that he has exhausted these parole claims by way of state habeas petitions.

As grounds for federal habeas relief, petitioner asserts that the denial of parole was not supported by the evidence. These claims are sufficient to require a response. *See Biggs v. Terhune*, 334 F.3d 910, 916-17 (9th Cir. 2003) (warning that repeated denial of parole based on unchanging characteristics of offense might violate due process); *McQuillion v. Duncan*, 306 F.3d 895, 904 (9th Cir. 2002) (due process requires that at least "some evidence" support parole denial).

### **CONCLUSION**

- 1. The clerk shall mail a copy of this order and the petition with all attachments to the respondent and the respondent's attorney, the Attorney General of the State of California. The clerk shall also serve a copy of this order on the petitioner.
- 2. Respondent shall file with the court and serve on petitioner, within sixty days of the issuance of this order, an answer conforming in all respects to Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, showing cause why a writ of habeas corpus should not be granted. Respondent shall file with the answer and serve on petitioner a copy of all portions of the state trial record that have been transcribed previously and that are relevant to a determination of the issues presented by the petition.

If petitioner wishes to respond to the answer, he shall do so by filing a traverse with the court and serving it on respondent within thirty days of his receipt of the answer.

respondent by mailing a copy of the document to respondent's counsel. Papers intended to be filed in this case should be addressed to the clerk rather than to the undersigned. Petitioner also must keep the court informed of any change of address by filing a separate paper with the clerk headed "Notice of Change of Address," and comply with any orders of the court within the time allowed, or ask for an extension of that time. Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). *See Martinez v. Johnson*, 104 F.3d 769, 772 (5th Cir. 1997) (Rule 41(b) applicable in habeas cases).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August \_\_\_\_3\_\_\_\_, 2007.

WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

 $G:\ \ PRO-SE\ \ WHA\ \ HC.07\ \ montenegro 906.osc.wpd$